

United States Government

Department of Energy

Rocky Flats Office

memorandum

DATE: FEB 11 1991

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: ERD:RB:1046

SUBJECT: Meeting With Jefferson County on Settlement Agreement Lands

TO: Frazer R. Lockhart, Director, Environmental Restoration Division



Attached is the subject meeting agenda and the minutes of the meeting. Would RFP have any interest in purchasing the Settlement Agreement Lands from Jefferson County?

Bob Birk
Bob Birk
Project Manager, OU3

Attachments

cc: D. Simonson, DOE/RFO

A-OU03-000218

Minutes JEFFCO Meeting
February 1, 1991

1. JeffCo lawyer Mary Lynn Tucker took the following positions regarding the Settlement Agreement lands:
 - a. RFP has done nothing to remediate the lands;
 - b. The county policy is that their people don't go on the lands due to negative health risks;
 - c. Jeffco will not perform weed or prairie dog control, even if funded by RFP because that is the responsibility of RFP;
 - d. Semi-annual soil reports are due to JeffCo in July and December and RFP should cc Gary Finstad at the Soil Conservation Service;
 - e. Would RFP consider buying the Settlement Agreement lands from JeffCo? She posed this question as her own and it does not represent a request from the County Commissioners.
2. Gary Finstad said weed control is priority #1. Killing weeds will promote grass growth and help control the expansion of the prairie dog population.
3. RFP briefed attendees on:
 - a. CERCLA/SARA, OU-3, and the relationship to future Settlement lands remediation and the potential conflict between CERCLA and the court ordered remediation;
 - b. Preliminary indications of low risk. County people went ballistic and apparently are not interested in hearing about levels of risk;
 - c. RFP requested the County consider that RFP put off future tilling until after completion of the RI Report.
4. JeffCo's position was that RFP should proceed with the Settlement Agreement to the letter.
5. RFP said we will look into RFP's hesitance to use herbicides for weed control.
6. RFP promised to send Jeffco the new soils data expected from the lab in February - March, 1991.

Conclusion: Meeting was not very productive. RFP will explore whether there would be any interest at RFP for purchasing the land. RFP also believes that JeffCo may be responsible for weed and pest control under the maintenance terms of the Settlement Agreement.

AGENDA

JeffCo/RFP Meeting February 1, 1991 Settlement Agreement Lands

- I. Introduction
 - a. new people
 - b. apparent potential problems
 - c. establish communications
 - d. resolve issues through dialog
- II. Technical Discussion of Annual Soils Report
 - a. JeffCo feedback
 - b. Problems
 - Weed control
 - Prairie Dog control
 - c. Potential solutions
 - JeffCo services/RFP funding
 - No action
- III. CERCLA/SARA (Superfund)
 - a. Retroactive character
 - b. RI, sampling, risk assessment, final remedy
 - c. OU-3, Settlement Agreement Lands
 - d. Impacting a SWMU (IHSS), - language
 - e. Legal opinion CERCLA/Settlement Agreement
 - f. IAG/OU-3 Schedule
- IV. Present Risk
 - a. Remedy Report data (preliminary, not QA'd) - graph
 - b. Recent data aquisition
 - tilling vs. natural processes
 - quantifiable risk
- V. RI Benefits
 - a. Identifies all contaminants of concern
 - b. Asesses exposure & toxicity
 - c. Characterizes (quantifies) risk (human health, ecological)
 - d. Provides info to determine best remedial action
- VI. Reconcile CERCLA & Settlement Agreement
- VII. Summary